

REMARKS:

The courtesies extended to the undersigned by Examiner Stefan Kruer during the telephone interview held October 19, 2009 are acknowledged and appreciated. As was discussed with Examiner Kruer during that telephone interview, applicants, their principal representatives in Germany and the undersigned have carefully reviewed the Final Office Action of July 20, 2009 in the subject U.S. patent application, together with the prior art cited and relied on in the rejections of the claims. In response, independent claims 27 and 43, as well as various ones of the dependent claims have been amended. Independent claim 38 has been cancelled. It is believed that this Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest effort by the undersigned to place the application in condition for allowance without raising any new issues and without requiring the Examiner to conduct any further searching. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims, is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action of July 20, 2009, claim 39 was objected to because of claim language which the Examiner believed was inapt. In response, claim 39 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. It is believed that this revision of the language of claim 39 overcome the Examiner's objection to that claim.

Independent claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, claim 38 has been cancelled. It is believed that the cancellation of claim 38 renders its rejection moot.

Claims 27, 29, 30, 43, 44 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent no. 6,010,091 to Leskinen in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,586,221 to Rosen. Claims 31, 32, 39-42, 49, 50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Leskinen in view of Rosen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,280,669 to Leanna.

In response to the rejections of independent claims 27 and 43 as being unpatentable over Leskinen in view of Rosen, both of these claims, as well as various ones of the dependent claims have been amended to even more clearly patentably define the subject invention over those two references, taken either singly or in combination. It is believed that independent claims 27 and 43, as well as the dependent claims now pending in the application are patentable for the following reasons.

Referring initially to currently amended claim 27, together with the Substitute Specification and the sole sheet of drawings, there is recited a method for threading a web of material in a web processing machine. The web processing machine is a printing press, generally at 01, which includes a reel changer 03, a printing unit 02 and a longitudinal folding hopper 04. A leading end of a web of material, typically paper, is threaded through the printing press, starting at a web receiving area, which is typically adjacent the reel changer, through the printing unit 02 and to a web delivery area which is typically adjacent a longitudinal fold former 04. This leading end of the web of material is attached to a web threading device 06 in the receiving area 08, before the printing unit. The web threading device 06 is caused to travel along a web threading path, through the printing unit and the longitudinal fold former.

In accordance with the present invention, the web receiving area has a torque-controlled motor 21. The web delivery area has a speed controlled motor 21. As is recited in currently amended claims 27 and 43, and as is discussed in the Substitute Specification, and specifically at paragraphs 036 and 037 thereof, the web delivery area

drive motor 11, which is located after the printing unit, has more strength than the web receiving area drive motor 08, which is located generally adjacent the reel changer 03. This will allow the speed-controlled web delivery area drive motor to control the tension in the web of material since it essentially overtakes the less strong web receiving area drive motor 21 which, as was discussed above, and which, as is recited in the claims, is torque controlled. As the web threading device 06 is pulled by the delivery area drive motor 11 from the receiving area through the printing unit and the delivery area, it threads the leading end of a web material, at the proper tension, through the printing press and along the web threading path.

In the Final Office Action of July 20, 2009, the Leskinen reference was characterized as providing a number of features of the subject method, as recited in claim 27, and of the device, as recited in claim 43. A carefully reading of the Leskinen reference fails to support those assertions.

In the Leskinen reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,010,091 there is described a paper web slitting device. As may be seen in Fig. 1, a large paper reel 12 is placed at an unwind station 10. A leading end of that paper web W is attached to a threading bar, generally at 21, as may be seen in Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5A and 5B. The threading bar 21 is pulled along a web travel path and through a slit part 40, where it is slit longitudinally into a plurality of partial width web segments. These web segments are fed to a first winding station winding drum 57 and to a second winding station winding drum 58.

When the web W is to be attached to the threading bar 21, the paper reel 12 is caused to rotate by an undisclosed means. The web leading end is grasped by a suction roll 11, which is supported by a pivot arm 11' and the web leading end is passed

over a guide roll 14 to a web end fastening device 20. As seen in Fig. 3, that web end fastening device 20 severs the leading end of the web W and inserts it into an open clamp 71 in the threading bar 21.

The threading bar 21 is pulled through the machine by a plurality of draw fabrics 25. These draw fabrics are pulled from the web end fastening device 20 to the slitler 40 by a winding shaft 32. That winding shaft is driven by a drive gear 34.

In the Final Office Action, it was asserted, at bullet point 3 on page 3 of the detailed action, that the web threading path included the path depicted in dashed lines in Fig. 2 and identified as 62. In fact, element 62 is a chain track. It is usable to guide chains 61 which will return the threading bar 21 back to the location in the web end fastening device 20 after the web W has been threaded the chain track 62 is an endless loop along which the chains 61 travel.

It was asserted that there is provided a drive motor to drive the paper reel 12 at a constant speed and/or chains 62 at the web receiving area and a second drive motor to power the drive gear 34 at the web delivery area. It is noted that there is no drive motor recited for the paper roll 12. As discussed at column 5, lines 44-46 "...there is a paper reel 12 which is unwound to provide a paper web W...". At lines 57-60, of column 5, it is further recited that "...in the stage shown in Fig. 2, the reel 12 revolves at a substantially constant speed and the web W is taken apart from the reel 12 face by means of a suction roll 11...". Once the web end has been attached to the threading bar 21, that threading bar "...starts carrying it through the machine." (column 6, lines 8 and 9). It is quite clear that any drive for the paper reel 12 is not driving the reel 12 at a constant speed.

The chains 61, which are used only to return the threading bar 21 back to its start position, as seen in Fig. 2, are caused to move along a chain path 62 by a separate gear drive which is not specifically identified. The drive for the chains 61 has nothing to do with pulling the threading bar 21 and the web leading end through the paper web slitting machine of Leskinen from the web receiving area to the web delivery area.

It was asserted, at bullet point 5 on page 3 of the detailed action that the second drive motor of the Leskinen reference is the motor which is used to power the drive gear 34. Since this motor is referred to in the Office Action, at bullet point 4, as the second motor, it must be assumed that either the non-disclosed motor for the paper reel 12 or the non-disclosed motor for the chains 61 is the first motor. Of these two asserted first motors, it would be more logical to assume that the non-disclosed motor for the paper reel would be the first motor.

In bullet point 6 at page 3 of the detailed action, it is asserted that Leskinen teaches the step of "...regulating a first motor in said web delivery area at a predetermined motor torque...", referring to column 3, line 41 and to column 6, lines 23-28. Both of these locations discuss the drive motor for the threading equipment; i.e. drive gear 34. The motor for the drive gear 34 is thus identified as the "second motor" in bullet point 5 and the "first motor" in bullet point 6. Clearly, it cannot be both.

The Leskinen reference does not provide a teaching of the subject method, as recited in currently amended claim 27, or of the subject device, as set forth in currently amended claim 43. In both claims, there is recited a strong motor at the web delivery area, a less strong motor at the web receiving area, control of the speed of the strong motor and control of the torque of the less strong motor. Both claims further recite the

use of the second, strong motor, at the web delivery area to pull the web threading means or device to the web delivery area from the web receiving area against the regulated motor torque of the less strong web threading means drive motor located at the web receiving area. Clearly, Leskinen does not show, or suggest this method or structure.

In the telephone interview of October 19, 2009, Examiner Kruer suggested that the secondary reference to Rosen might provide the teachings of the subject invention, which are missing from the Leskinen reference. The undersigned respectfully but strenuously does not agree with that position. Initially, the Rosen reference is directed to a method and device for the torque control of multiple motors that are usable to feed a continuous strand of welding wire W from a supply reel 10 of such welding wire to a welding gun 12, as may be seen in Fig. 1. The Rosen device is clearly not directed to a web leading end threading device for a printing press. At best, the Rosen reference would be possibly relevant after the web had been threaded through the printing press and was being printed in a steady state operation. Rosen is not described to any type of lead-in or leading end feeding device. There is no reason why the teachings of the Rosen reference could or should be combined with those of the Leskinen reference. Even if they were, the result would not be similar to the subject invention.

In Rosen, the welding wire W is fed from the supply reel 10 to the welding gun by the combined efforts of a pull motor or PLM and a push motor or PSM. The pull motor is recited as being located near or integrated with the welding gun, as recited at column 2. The push motor or PSM is located between the pull motor and the reel 10 for wire W. The pull motor establishes and maintains a selected rate of wire feed. The push motor

is regulated to the pull motor. Its load torque is regulated by the load torque of the pull motor. As discussed with Examiner Kruer, and as set forth at the bottom of column 2 and at the top of column 3 of the Rosen reference, the pull motor is typically integrated with the welding gun unit. It is of a comparatively low power rating. The pull motor PLM, which is located at the welding gun 12, is of light weight and of low strength. The push motor or PSM, which is situated on a stationary base intermediate the supply reel 10 of the welding wire W and the pull motor, "...can be larger and of much higher power rating for handling the major portion of the wire feed load.". The Examiner's attention is directed to column 3, lines 3-6.

Examiner Kruer suggested that it might be within the ability of one of skill in the art to reverse the motor teachings in Rosen, so that they would be more like the locations recited in claims 27 and 43 of the subject invention. Such a suggestion is clearly contrary to the specific teachings of the Rosen reference. The pull motor PLM is intended to be "...integrated with the welding gun unit...". It can thus be of "...comparatively low power rating...", all as recited at lines 74 and 75 of column 2. The pull motor PLM of Rosen is "...of light weight for facilitating manipulation of the gun by the welder.". Note the discussion at column 3, lines 2 and 3. It is quite clear that in the Rosen device, the stronger push motor PSM is located at the wire receiving area adjacent to the wire reel 10 and that the less strong PLM is located at the wire delivery area, at the wire gear. This is the opposite of the arrangement recited in claims 27 and 43 of the subject invention. It is clear that one of skill in the art would not switch the locations of the motors in Rosen. It would not make any sense to have the larger and stronger motor of Rosen integrated with the welding gun. The result of such a

modification would be an assembly in which the welding gun would no longer be light and easy to manipulate. Any combination that would result from Leskinen and Rosen would not render obvious the method of currently amended claim 27 or the device of currently amended claim 43. Both of these claims are thus believed to be patentable over the prior art cited and relied on.

All of the rest of the claims that are pending in the subject application depend from one or the other of believed allowable independent claims 27 and 43. All of these claims are thus also believed to be allowable. The Leanna reference, which was cited in combination with Leskinen and Rosen to reject various ones of the dependent claims, has been discussed in detail in the prior Second Amendment. This reference does not show or suggest the subject invention for the reasons set forth in that Second Amendment.

Claim 38 was rejected over Leskinen in view of Rosen and further in view of U.S. Patent no. 4,531,166 to Anderson. Since claim 38 has now been cancelled, that rejection is moot.

The prior art cited but not relied on in the rejections of the claims has been noted. Since it was not utilized in the rejections of the claims, no discussion thereof is believed to be required.


SUMMARY:

Independent claims 27 and 43, as well as various ones of the dependent claims, have been amended. Independent claim 38 has been cancelled. It is believed that the claims which are now pending in the application are patentable over the prior art cited and relied on, as was discussed with Examiner Kruer during the telephone interview of October 19, 2009. It is further believed that this Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest effort by the undersigned to place the application in condition for allowance without raising additional issues and without requiring the Examiner to conduct any additional searching. Allowance of the claims, and passage of the application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wolfgang FISCHER et al.
Applicants

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicants



Douglas R. Hanscom
Reg. No. 26,600

October 20, 2009
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Customer No. 23294
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, Virginia 22202
Phone: (703) 415-1500
Fax: (703) 415-1508
E-mail: mail@jonestullarcooper.com
Attorney Docket: W1.2278PCT-US